

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIAJANVIER VILLARS,
Plaintiff,

v.

PAM BONDI, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-04239-RS

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTIONS**


Plaintiff Janvier Villars has now filed three motions styled as ex parte applications for emergency injunctive relief. *See* Dkt. Nos. 1, 10, 15. He has additionally filed a motion demanding clarification of a previous denial of injunctive relief. *See* Dkt. No. 16. Plaintiff fundamentally misunderstands the respective roles of the Court and the parties. It is Plaintiff's burden to comply with the procedural and substantive rules and to plead facts sufficient to state a claim. It is not the obligation of the courts to rebut his multitude of unsupported assertions, none of which state a valid claim for relief. Moreover, this Court is neither obligated nor authorized to overrule the valid orders of other courts.

Contrary to Plaintiff's beliefs, he is simply not entitled to detailed explanations of why his contentions, many of which border on incomprehensible, fail. In short, Plaintiff has not stated any grounds justifying emergency relief because he has not established any of the threshold requirements to seek relief in federal court—including, but not limited to, Article III standing, statement of a claim, or federal jurisdiction over this matter. Accordingly, his most recent Motion

for injunctive relief, Dkt. 15, and Motion for Clarification, Dkt. 16, are denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 11, 2025



RICHARD SEEBORG
Chief United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California